

ORIGINAL

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

No. 15-1314C

(Filed: December 18, 2015)

* * * * *

BRIAN L. SNOKE,

Plaintiff,

FILED

DEC 18 2015

v.

U.S. COURT OF
FEDERAL CLAIMS

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

* * * * *

ORDER

Plaintiff, appearing *pro se*, filed a document entitled “Extra Administrative Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, which the clerk’s office docketed as a new complaint on November 2, 2015.¹ That document is a pre-printed form for submitting *pro se* habeas corpus petitions in the state court system of California. It contains open spaces for prisoners to submit the necessary information for a habeas petition. The verbiage supplied by plaintiff in this document is completely unintelligible. We are unable to discern any cognizable legal claim, let alone a claim within the jurisdiction of this court. We must therefore dismiss this case for want of jurisdiction. *See Rule 12(h)(3) of the Rules of the United States Court of Federal Claims.*

Plaintiff also attempted to file a document entitled “Application Ex parte for local court rules and modification of responsive and traversive pleading time limits,” which the clerk’s office declined to file due to several procedural

¹ Plaintiff filed a prior complaint in this court in 2014, which was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction on January 26, 2015. *Snoke v. United States*, No. 14-1197 (Fed. Cl. Jan 26, 2015) (unpublished opinion dismissing complaint).

defects. Although this might be construed as a request for a copy of the rules, it would make no difference even considering plaintiff's *pro se* status. It is thus to be returned unfiled.

Accordingly, the following is ordered:

1. The Clerk is directed to return the document received on December 7, 2015 unfiled.
3. The Clerk is directed to dismiss the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and enter judgment accordingly. No costs.



ERIC G. BRUGGINK
Judge